1

JEFF W. REISIG

301 Second Street

Attorney for People

DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF YOLO COUNTY

By: Garrett Hamilton/173423 Deputy District Attorney

Woodland, California 95695

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF

Telephone: (530) 666-8180 DA File Number: 08H03355

2

3

5

6 7

8

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

19 20

21

23

25

24

26

27

28

18

CALIFORNIA,

vs.

Marco Antonio Topete,

Defendant(s)

Plaintiff,

YOLO SUPERIOR COURT

By Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF YOLO

Dept. 9 Case No. 08-3355

People's Motion to Continue May 29th Status Conference

Date: May 15th Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept: 9

To the Honorable Judge Timothy L. Fall, the Defendant, and Counsel for the Defendant, Mr. Hayes Gable and Mr. Tom Purtell:

Please take notice that at the above time and place the People will move the court to continue the currently scheduled May 29th hearing to either June 5th in the afternoon, or June 12th in the afternoon. This motion will be based on the following points and authorities, and declaration.

Points and Authorities

Applicable California statutes permit continuance of preliminary hearing or trial at the request of either the defense or the prosecution upon a showing of "good cause."

(Pen. Code, §§ 859b, 1050(e).) "What constitutes good cause for the delay of a criminal trial is a matter that lies within the discretion of the trial court." (People v. Johnson (1980) 26 Cal.3d 557, 570; see also, People v. Strozier (1993) 20 Cal.App.4th 55, 60.) A trial court's ruling on a motion for a continuance is ordinarily reviewed for an abuse of discretion. (People v. Jenkins (2000) 22 Cal.4th 900, 1037.)

1.3

In Owens v. Superior Court (1980) 28 Cal.3d 238, the California Supreme Court set forth the legal criteria of good cause when a continuance is sought to secure the attendance of a witness: "'(1) That the movant has exercised due diligence in an attempt to secure the attendance of the witness at the trial by legal means; (2) that the expected testimony is material; (3) that it is not merely cumulative; (4) that it can be obtained within a reasonable time; and (5) that the facts to which the witness will testify cannot otherwise be proven.' " (Id. at p. 251; see also, People v. Howard (1992) 1 Cal.4th 1132, 1171.)

Good cause for a continuance has been found to exist when a prosecution witness was unavailable through no lack of prosecutorial diligence. (Gaines v. Municipal Court (1980) 101 Cal.App.3d 556, 558-562; Pickett v. Municipal Court (1970) 12 Cal.App.3d 1158, 1162-1163.) And in People v. Bronaugh (1950) 100 Cal.App.2d 220, the court found good cause for a continuance where prosecution witnesses were hospitalized and unable to appear for trial. (See also, People v. Bracamonte (1967) 253 Cal.App.2d 980, 984.)

A properly served subpoena may, by itself, show sufficient due diligence. In Gaines v. Municipal Court, supra, 101

Cal.App.3d 556, for example, the prosecution requested a continuance beyond the statutory time for trial until a subpoenaed police officer who was a material witness returned from vacation. The trial court found good cause for a continuance. The Court of Appeal rejected defense arguments that the prosecution should have made additional efforts to contact the police officer. The subpoena alone showed the exercise of due diligence. (Similarly, see *People v. Alvarez* (1989) 208 Cal.App.3d 567, 578.)

Declaration

I, Garrett Hamilton, am one of the prosecutors assigned to prosecute this case. We currently have a status conference set for May 29th. I make this motion because neither of the assigned prosecutors, myself nor Jeff Reisig, are available for that court date.

I have conferred with defense counsel and I understand that there is no opposition to this motion. Their preference would be that it be moved to either June 5th or June 12th, in the afternoon. We would make either one of those dates work for us in the event the court grants this motion. I am asking that this motion be heard on May 15th because it is my understanding that this Court is only available for these matters on Fridays during the month of May. Asking for May 8th seemed to be pushing it considering the number of people required to gather for this case.

Counsel are scheduled to meet regarding the jury questionnaire on May 13th.

|| / / /

1.4

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is correct.

Executed on May 6, 2009, at Woodland, California.



GARRETT HAMILTON/173423 DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Δ

О

SUPERIOR COURT No. 08-3355

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, WENDY WILCOX, declare:

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the county of Yolo; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is 301 Second Street, Woodland, California 95695.

On May 6, 2009, I served the within PEOPLE'S MOTION TO CONTINUE MAY 29TH STATUS CONFERENCE on counsel for defendant in this action, by hand delivering a true copy thereof to the Law Office of Thomas Purtell at 430 Third Street, Woodland, Ca 95695.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 6, 2009, at Woodland, California.

WENDY WILCOX WENDY WILCOX

SUPERIOR COURT NO. 08-3355

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, WENDY WILCOX, declare that I am a resident of the County of Yolo; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action; my business address is 301 Second Street, Woodland, California 95695.

On May 6, 2009, I served the within PEOPLE'S MOTION TO CONTINUE MAY 29TH STATUS CONFERENCE on counsel for defendant in this action, by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a scaled envelope and deposited the same in the United States mail at Woodland, California, addressed to the counsel of record in this action, as follows:

HAYES GABLE ATTORNEY AT LAW 428 J ST., STE. 354 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 6, 2009, at Woodland, California

WENDY WILCOX